

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted in response to the office action dated June 27, 2007. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and arguments.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, and 6-8 as being clearly anticipated by Yurdin (Fig.5; col.5, lines 10-17. He stated that the housing 14' of Yurdin around a blower 16 would disclose applicants "separate manifold" and that the baffle 110 would provide means within the separate manifold for directing airflow in a desired direction. He further states that applicants' claims would not preclude the blower being located within the "so-called "separate manifold"".

Applicants' reiterate that Yurdin does not provide a manifold, let alone a separate manifold. Yurdin teaches a housing 14' which is of slightly different shape than the housing 14. Instead of having an opening which communicates with the ambient atmosphere, the housing 14' has a duct connection 80 attached to the housing 14' by screws 82. This duct connection 80 fastens to the sidewall 44' of the duct by screws 84. In the housing 14' there is located a motor 10' driving a blower 16'. The Examiner is incorrect by stating that Yurdin would disclose a housing 14' in which is located the blower 16 as a manifold. Yurdin states "a motor 10' drives a blower 16' located in a housing 14'" (col.4, l.25-26). Thus, he does not describe a manifold. In fact, there is nothing in Yurdin that appears to be a manifold. The Examiner quotes a sentence from Applicants' application out of context. In its entirety, Applicants' describe their manifold, by stating

By "manifold" is meant a component, which, when attached to the device, defines a chamber having at least one opening leading to the atmosphere. It is preferable that the manifold have a plurality of openings, and the use of the term "opening" herein refers to both singular and plural. The nature and location of this opening is not narrowly critical and can be arranged to suit any suitable application. The opening can be a simple opening in an otherwise closed manifold, or it can be a tube extending from the manifold. The opening may also be variable in direction. For example, it may pivot about one or more axes, so that it can be pointed in any desired direction. The manifold may be equipped with means for partially or completely closing the opening, so that the emission of evaporable material can be regulated. The manifold is arranged on the device, so that the fan or blower blows air containing evaporable material into the manifold and hence into the atmosphere. The manifold may be merely a chamber with an opening, or it may

comprise at least one internal baffle that directs the air containing evaporable material entering the manifold in a desired direction." (Specification, Page 4)

There is nothing in the specification that takes away from the classic dictionary definitions of a manifold, such as a manifold being a pipe or chamber that has a number of branches or inlets or outlets. In other words, it is purely a device in which a fluid or mixture is either brought together from a variety of sources via a number of inlets, or from which a fluid or mixture is separated into a variety of outlets. Examples of a manifold include the fuel-air mixture in a car, which typically enters a manifold and then enters the individual cylinders via individual conduits extending from that manifold, or, at the other side, the exhaust system, in which separate exhaust ducts from the individual cylinders come together in a manifold to lead eventually to the exhaust pipe. The point is that the manifold is something separate from the working parts which utilizes its dividing/uniting functions - it has no working parts itself, serving only to collect or separate the fluids. The use of the word "separate" emphasizes that this is a member distinct from the other parts of the device.

In addition, Applicants submit that reference 110 of Yurdin has nothing to do with a baffle, but simply a movable vane, designed to open and close, part of a so-called check valve (see description of operation on col. 5, l. 4-22).

For these reasons, Applicants invention as claimed is not anticipated by Yurdin.

The Examiner also maintained his rejection of claims 1, 4, 4-8 and 10-12 by Jane et al. '615. The Jane '615 reference also does not include a separate manifold which is disposed above the wick and which comprises at least one vent extending to the atmosphere and at least one internal baffle adapted to direct said airflow in a desired direction. In contrast, Jane neither teaches nor suggests a manifold, let alone a manifold including a vent and a baffle for directing the air flow into a specific direction.

Since all claims cited in this rejection include directly or indirectly the separate manifold, all such claims are clearly distinguishable over Jane, and thus the reference should be removed.

Similarly, the Examiner also maintained his rejection of claims 1, 3, 6-9 11 and 12 by Jane et al. '967. Jane '967 also does not include a separate manifold which is disposed about

SEP 27 2007

the blower and which comprises at least one vent extending to the atmosphere and at least one internal baffle adapted to direct said airflow in a desired direction. In contrast, Jane '967 neither teaches nor suggests a manifold, let alone a manifold including a vent and a baffle for directing the air flow into a specific direction. The slotted features in cover 46 are simply that "slots", they are neither a baffle nor a manifold.

For these reasons, Applicants invention as claimed is not anticipated by either Jane reference. Thus, Applicants claims are clearly distinguishable over Jane '967, and thus the reference should be removed.

Finally, the Examiner rejected Claim 12 as being anticipated by any one of Mulvaney et al '086 (Fig.1), Mulvaney '993 (Fig.1) and Mulvaney '550 (Fig. 1). It is nor clear to Applicants where the Examiner sees the elements claimed in the reference. Consistent with the discussion above, Mulvaney does not have a separate manifold and thus, the reference does not anticipate claim 12 , which includes such separate manifold.

For these reasons, Applicants invention as claimed in claim 12 is not anticipated by Mulvaney '993 and Mulvaney '550. Thus, Applicants claims are clearly distinguishable over these references, and thus the references should be removed.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 27 2007

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By Christa Hildebrand

Christa Hildebrand
Reg. No. 34,953
875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844
Facsimile: (212) 808-0844